DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 300 IR 007 317

AUTHOR Weintraub, D. Kathryn
TITLE Problems of Corporate Entries: Some Alternative Solutions, An Historical Survey.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Indiana Library Association (April 18, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Catalogs; Institutions; Organizations (Groups); *Subject Index Terms
IDENTIFIERS *Corporate Entries

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the treatment of problems pertaining to the choice of corporate entry, name, and form of name for corporate bodies in various catalog codes in order to illustrate some alternative solutions to the problem of corporate names in catalog codes. One conclusion is that corporate entries should be retained within the set of entries for a work because, while they many not represent author entries in one sense of the word, they are authors in another sense. A second conclusion is that the form of corporate name be chosen so that the entry fulfills additional functions in the catalog. (Author)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED171300

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Problems of Corporate Entries:

# Some Alternative Solutions, An Historical Survey

by

Kathryn Weintraub

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Katherine Weintraub

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR007317

Problems of Corporate Entries: some alternative solutions: an historical survey. Paper read at meeting of Indiana Library Association, District I, April 18, 1978.

D. Kathryn Weintraub
Graduate Library School, University of Chicago

## Introduction

One important aspect of catalog organization is the assignment of a set of headings for each bibliographic description. These headings define the set of possible access points through which a user can identify the works in a collection. Logically, the determination of a set of such access points involves two different series of steps. These two different series of steps are, first, the selection of a set of entities (or concepts) to be named as access points and, second, the choice of a name and form of name for each such entity (or concept). Corporate entries have proven problematic in both respects. Throughout the history of catalog codes from 1841 to date, the same two questions have recurred,

1. When should a corporate name be included in the set of access points?
2. When a corporate name is to be included, what is that name and what is its form?

It is not my purpose today to tell you what the answers to these questions should be. Rather, I would like to summarize some of the more prominent opinions on these questions in order to clarify the content of some of the issues. An understanding of these issues should prove more useful than knowledge of any one specific code. For this purpose, I think the most significant texts to consider are

1. Cutter, Charles. Rules for a dictionary catalog / by Charles A. Cutter.--4th ed., rewritten.--Washington : Govt. Print. Off., 1904.

2. International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, 1961, Paris. Statement of principles adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, Oct. 1961.--Annotated ed. : with commentary and examples / by Eva Verona ; assisted by Franz Georg Kaltwasser, P.R. Lewis, Roger Pierrot.--London : IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1971.

   n.b. These principles are commonly called The Paris Principles and the conference is commonly called the ICCP.

3. Verona, Eva. Corporate headings : their use in library catalogues and national bibliographies : a comparative and critical study / by Eva Verona.--London : IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1975.

4. Anglo-American cataloguing rules, 2d ed. not yet published and not yet available for public scrutiny

5. IFLA Working Group on Corporate Headings. "Report" / IN Cataloging Service Bulletin 124 (Winter 1978) pp. 11-16.

It is usually assumed that both

1) the set of access points for a work and

2) the names designating these points together with the forms

for these names are chosen so as to fulfill both the so-called finding list and gathering function of a public catalog. These functions were initially formulated by Charles Cutter as the first two of his three objects of a catalog:

1. To enable a person to find a book of which either
   (A) the author
   (B) the title } is known
   (C) the subject

2. To show what the library has
   (D) by a given author
   (E) on a given subject
   (F) in a given kind of literature..." (Cutter, 1904, p. 13)

In the Statement of Principles adopted in 1961 (commonly called The Paris principles) at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (ICCP), the finding list and gathering functions were re-worded

both so as to omit references to entries under subject or form of work and to add to the definition of the gathering function, the idea that all editions of a work should be identified,

"2 Functions of the Catalogue

The catalogue should be an efficient instrument for ascertaining

2.1 whether the library contains a particular book specified by
(a) its author and title or
(b) if the author is not named in the book its title alone, or
(c) if the author and title are inappropriate or insufficient for identification, a suitable substitute for the title; and

2.2 (a) which books by a particular author and
(b) which editions of a particular work are in the library."

(ICCP, p. xiii)

Usually, the set of access points for a work is defined so as to fulfill the finding list function. Thus, for example, headings are assigned for any person or corporate body that fulfills an authorship function regardless of whether that function is primary or secondary or subsidiary so that the user can find the work in the collection using the information he has available to him. Furthermore, the names and their forms are supposedly chosen so as to be easily findable and, finally, the form of the chosen name is established so that all works entered under that name will be gathered in a single place within the public catalog. In addition, I would also like to suggest that, in some codes, certain names have been chosen so as to fulfill a different type of gathering or collocating function. Thus, for example, some corporate names have been entered under place name so as to collocate them with works entered under government headings and with works entered

under such subject headings as

INDIANAPOLIS SPEEDWAY RACE

or

CHICAGO. CLARENCE BUCKINGHAM FOUNTAIN

I. Members of the set of Descriptive Access Points

Members of the set of descriptive access points include the names of authors and the titles of works. For many applications it is important to identify one of these access points as the main entry; the other access points then become the added entries. Usually, the main entry is the name of the author or principal author when known or else the title of the work when either the author is unknown or when more than three authors contributed to the principal intellectual content of the work. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to suppose that added entries for authors occur only when more than one author contributed to the intellectual content of the work and not in those cases where the main entry is under title because the author is unknown.

This dichotomy is not so neat as it initially appears, however. Recent discussions of catalog codes have shown that there is some ambiguity involved in the use of the term 'corporate authorship'. Thus, a corporate body could be said not to be a corporate author in one sense of the term and yet to be considered a corporate author in some other sense of the term. In these cases it could be argued that the main entry should be under title when the author is unknown in one sense of the term and with an added entry when the corporate body is known to be the author in some other sense of the word.

This ambiguity in the term 'corporate authorship' can be traced

back at least as far as Charles Cutter's exposition of his principle of corporate authorship. His general principle read thus,

General principle.

45. Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority. (Cutter, p. 41)

In his further exposition of this principle, Cutter introduced at least three different criteria for the choice of a corporate author heading (and the 1908 code introduced a fourth criterion). By introducing these additional criteria he changed the definition of authorship for those works where corporate responsibility was involved. His reason for doing so was stated clearly: he thought that access points under corporate names would prove more convenient to the user than a system where the only access point for such works was under title.

> "The American way is preferable for two reasons: first, because as a matter of fact these bodies are the authors not only of their own proceedings but also of their collections regarded as a whole; secondly, because as a matter of convenience, both in the enlargement of the library and in the service of the public, it is better that all the books connected with the name of a society or government should be brought together in one place."
>
> (Cutter, p. 40)

Accordingly, in addition to authorship in the sense of responsibility for the creative or intellectual content of the work, Cutter also introduced the two additional 'authorship' principles of subject

> "It is true that in a dictionary catalog this may be accomplished more or less inappropriately by entry under the name of the society as a subject; but in an author catalog it does not come about at all."
>
> (Cutter, p. 40, next sentence)

and name most closely associated with the work,

> "There remains only (3) the few anonymous works published by a department which do not relate to the country. Whether or not they ought to be entered under the first word like any other anonymous work, it seems to me that there should be an entry under the department, which, even more than in the case

> of works issued with their authors' names, must be supposed to adopt the opinions of the work and assume responsibility for it."
>
> (Cutter, p. 40)

The 1908 code introduced the form of publication as an additional consideration for defining the subdivisions of some corporate names. This criteria was later found to be ambiguous as well. Lubetzky in his 1960 draft code claimed that some of these so-called form subdivisions were conventional or uniform titles, e.g.,

Constitution

Treaties, etc.

and some named the form of work, e.g.,

Laws, statutes, etc.

Thus, two characteristics of English and American cataloging codes are or at least have been

1) the use of corporate headings
2) the use of multiple criteria for the definition of corporate authorship.

In 1961, the use of corporate headings was broadened geographically to include all members of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA). The Paris Principles defined two different criteria for corporate authorship and recommended conventionalized titles be used rather than form subheadings for laws, constitutions, and treaties. The two principles defining corporate authorship were

1) the collective thought or activity of the corporate body
2) the wording of the title, or title page, taking in conjunction with the nature of the work

Thus, "9.1 The main entry for a work should be made under the name of a corporate body (i.e. any institution, organized body or assembly of persons known by a corporate or collective name),

"9.11 when the work is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body,[6] even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body, or

"9.12 when the wording of the title or title page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work.[7]

"9.5 Constitutions, laws and treaties, and certain other works having similar characteristics, should be entered under the name of the appropriate state or other territorial authority, with formal or conventional titles indicating the nature of the material...

---

[6]"e.g. official reports, rules and regulations, manifestoes, programmes and records of the results of collective work."

[7]"e.g. serials whose titles consist of a generic term (Bulletin, Transactions, etc.) preceded or followed by the name of a corporate body, and which include some account of the activities of the body."

(ICCP, p. 40-41; 62)

In her 1971 commentary on the Paris Principles, Verona found that the catalog codes based on these principles exemplified three different types of corporate authorship. These types were termed 'broad', 'restrictive' and 'formal'. The AACR represent a broad interpretation because they use more than one criteria to define corporate authorship. Restrictive interpretations based their definition on 9.11 (corporate thought or activity) rather than 9.12. Thus, such codes would make the main entry for

The cataloging-in-source experiment. A report to the Librarian of Congress by the Director of the Processing Department

under corporate name. The formalistic interpretations based their definition of corporate authorship on 9.12 (the title or title page) and required that the corporate body be named on the title page or in

the title and, often, that no personal author be named. With these codes the main entry for above publication would be under title.

Verona then undertook her study of Corporate headings (published in 1975) in order to determine a basis for possible agreement between these various definitions of corporate authorship. She defines corporate authorship as the result of creative or organizational activity, i.e.,

> "A work should be considered to be of corporate authorship if it may be concluded by its character or nature that it is necessarily the result of the creative and/or organizational activity of a corporate body as a whole, and not the result of an independent creative activity of the individual(s) who drafted it."
>
> (Verona, 1975, p. 13)

As a result many types of works which normally in our practice are entered under corporate name would be entered under personal author when known or else under title. In her view only the proceedings of a conference or the official report of an expedition are the result of the creative activity of a corporate body. Furthermore, only official reports, budgets, rules, regulations, catalogs, lists of members and constitutions are the result of organizational activity. Constitutions, incidentally would be entered under the corporate name for the promulgating authority together with conventional title, rather than under the name for the jurisdiction affected. Thus, for example, the constitution of Australia would be entered

Great Britain
[Constitution]

In the new edition of the AACR, apparently two criteria are used to define corporate authorship,

1. Does the work 'emanate from' a corporate body
2. The nature of the work

In addition added entries are frequently defined for those corporate bodies that fulfill corporate authorship in some other sense of the term 'corporate author.' Furthermore, or, perhaps, at last the old form subheadings have been consistently redefined as either titles or, often, uniform titles.

'Emanation' is certainly a narrower term than Cutter's corporate authorship. However, it includes at least two criteria in addition to 'creative and/or organizational activity.' The first of these criteria is that of promulgating agency. Several types of legal publications are to be entered under the promulgating agency rather than title and with added entry under the jurisdiction affected (i.e., added entry under the name most closely associated with the work) whenever the jurisdiction differs from the promulgating agency. These types of publication include

1) Laws (with uniform titles)

2) Administrative regulations (without uniform titles)

3) Court rules

In other cases the term 'emanation' apparently includes the idea of the name most closely associated with the work. Thus, the following types of publication would all be entered under the corporate name most closely associated with the work,

1) Official communications of heads of states, other government officials, popes, and other high ecclesiastical officials

2) Treaties between two or three governments

3) Charters and constitutions of a sovereign nation or a constituent state

Thus, for example,

Australia
[Constitution ([date])]

but

Detroit
[Charter (1933)]

and

Tennessee
Charter of the city of Nashville...

The types of work to receive corporate headings can be inferred from the preceding example that illustrate the apparent criteria for 'emanation.' They are, briefly,

1. those of an administrative nature dealing with the corporate body itself
2. legal and governmental works (such as laws, constitutions, treaties, court rules, etc.)
3. those which record the collective thought of the body (e.g. reports or official statements of position)
4. those which report the collective activity of a conference, an expedition, or an event.

Thus, corporate authors remain a problem. The term remains ambiguous despite careful analysis. Yet, we still believe (I think) that corporate entries are convenient for the user. For this reason, we are still willing to define authorship differently for corporate bodies than for personal authors and to use different types of entry (e.g. an added entry) when there is doubt as to the sense in which a corporate body can be called the author of a work—but we are unwilling to give them up.

Part II. Choice and Form of Corporate Name

Cutter regarded the second problem, namely

What is the corporate name and what is its form?

as the most important problem,

> "The chief difficulty with regard to bodies of men is to determine (1) what their names are, and (2) whether the name or some other word shall be the heading. In regard to (2) the catalogs hitherto published may be regarded as a series of experiments. No satisfactory usage has as yet been established. Local names have always very strong claims to be headings; but to enter the publications of all bodies of men under the places with which the bodies are connected is to push a convenient practice so far that it becomes inconvenient and leads to many rules entirely out of harmony with the rest of the catalog."
>
> (Cutter, p. 41)

Thus, Cutter clearly saw the issue as involving two logically distinct problems, namely

1) Choice of a name

2) Choice of a form of name

However, in his subsequent treatment of the issue it is clear first that he was unable to maintain this logical distinction and second that he was primarily concerned with the problem of choice of name. His criteria for the choice of a name combined such diverse considerations as identifying

1) the name which the body uses

2) the name by which the body is known, i.e. the conventional name

3) the name which would collocate works by and about that body together with works by and about other related corporate bodies

He did not define a clear hierarchy of choices between these criteria.

Furthermore, although, in practice, he treated both cases, he did

not clearly differentiate the two different situations in which a corporate body could have more than one name from which to choose for entry purposes. These two situations are

1) the corporate body has changed its name

2) the corporate body has two or more names at one time.

It was Cutter's practice to change the headings for all publications when the corporate body changed its name—a practice that is directly analogous to the common practice for personal authors who change their name. This practice for corporate bodies continued until 1967, when the present practice was introduced—namely, the works of a corporate body are entered under the name of the body at time of publication. I am sure this practice was introduced for economic reasons, but it conforms to the recommendations of the ICCP. In her study, Verona gives the reasoning behind this recommendation. Specifically,

> "...a change in the name of a corporate body may reflect a major organizational and constitutional change in the corporate body's identity." (Verona, 1975, p. 56)

In addition she points to a theoretical objection to the practice—namely that some name changes do <u>not</u> reflect changes in the identity of the body,

> "From a purely theoretical point of view, a restriction of the recommendations of section 9.45 to cases where simultaneous organizational and constitutional changes occur could be justified. It is only then, that a corporate body actually assumes a new identity, and accordingly section 9.45, thus limited in its applications, could be considered to be fulfilling the function of the alphabetical catalog as set out in section 2.2(a). But how often is a cataloguer able to acquire an accurate knowledge of the functions of a particular body?..." (Verona, 1975, p. 57)

and so she concludes that this practice is best,

> "Most of these points as well as the various advantages

> which section 9.45 offers (economy of cataloguing, unification of procedures adopted by various bibliographies, the booktrade and library catalogues, logical structure of uniform headings for subordinate units which have ceased to exist prior to a change in name of the parent body, etc.) have been fully examined and analyzed in professional literature. It is agreed that the advantages outweigh by far the theoretical weakness outlined above..." (Ibid.)

It is the second case, where the body is known in different sources by two or more names, that has caused the greatest difficulty. In his discussion, Cutter identified the following four types of corporate name,

1. the name as it reads (or the name in direct form)
2. conventional names, i.e. names by which a body is known in reference sources rather than on its own publications, e.g. The Warren Commission rather than The President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy.
3. The name of the place followed by the name of the place as it reads.
4. The name in inverted form.

The last two of these categories could be regarded as questions pertaining to the choice of a form for a name rather than problems involving the choice of a name. In the case of entry under place name, however, Cutter would have required entry under place name for some corporate bodies without regard to the question of whether or not the place name occurred as an element of the name by which the body was known. In those cases where entry under an inverted form is prescribed, this is clearly a statement of the form of the name rather than the choice of name. However, in this instance, it is convenient to treat the choice as a problem involving choice of name because in subsequent codes the names for the corporate bodies involved (i.e. orders of knighthood) came to be entered as conventional names.

Cutter's criteria for distinguishing these types of names and their various subclasses were confused. His general rule was to enter corporate bodies under the name as it reads,

> "61. Enter corporations and quasi-corporations both English and foreign under their names as they read, neglecting an initial article or serial number when there is one.
>
> "Refer from any other name by which a society is known, especially from the name of the place where its headquarters are, if it is often called by that name.
>
> ...
>
> "This includes associations, societies, clubs, guilds (72), business firms (74), institutes, private schools (87) colleges and universities (65, 75, 76, 80), libraries (77), galleries (77), museums (77), ecclesiastical organizations, churches (81), convents, monasteries (83) and all similar bodies, provided they have an individual name."
>
> (Cutter, 1904, p. 44)

Names as they read were not fully defined but included such subclasses as distinctive names (i.e., names beginning with a proper noun or adjective) e.g.,

Boston Athenaeum

or individual names (i.e., names taken from an individual) e.g.,

Bodleian Library.

Other classes of names were not clearly labelled by type, but were mentioned as rules governing the form of name for specific types of bodies.

He used conventional names for governments and for London guilds—two practices which continue to this day. For example, he used the headings

France

and

Stationers Company

rather than either

Republique Française

or

Masters and Keepers, or Wardens and Commonality of the Mystery and art of Stationers of the City of London

This latter exception was adopted because,

> "...1) it gives a heading easier to remember and 2) it is not always easy to ascertain the real name of the London companies." (Cutter, p. 46)

Thus, he also considered the cataloguer's convenience.

Many institutions without distinctive or individual names were entered under the name of the place or the state in which they were located. In those cases where the name of the place or state occurred as a part of the corporate name this could be considered inversion. However his code required entry under the name of the place or state whenever the institution did not have a distinctive or individual name. Thus

Paris Bibliotheque Nationale

Illinois. University

but

Boston Athenaeum

Indiana University

It was only in the case of orders of knighthood that he specifically required that the name be converted to bring forward the most significant word, e.g.

Templars, Knights

The details of these practices were reviewed by Lubetzky. He could find no more consistency than the above description suggests. Lubetzky found that, in later practice place names were often used for

bodies that had non-distinctive names and/or for bodies physically associated with a place e.g.

Boston. Children's Hospital

but then societies whose names were no more distinctive were entered directly, e.g.

Children's Aid Society, Boston

Children's Aid Society, New York

as were institutions with distinctive or individual names, e.g.

Enoch Pratt Free Public Library

The difficulty with such variations is that the user, whether a member of the public or a reference librarian or a technical services librarian cannot predict where to find the entry for a publication. Since this cannot be convenient for the user, Lubetzky concluded that all corporate bodies should be entered directly under their names as they read,

> "...The simplest answer would be to enter these bodies under their names followed by the name of the place required for their identification -- that is to treat the common name of a corporate body as its proper name..."
> (Lubetzky, Cataloging rules and principles, p. 1)

It is clear, however, within the context of the dictionary catalog that the corporate entries that began with place names fulfilled a subject function for they were interfiled with publications of the local governments e.g.

Chicago. Council

Chicago. Mayor

and with works entered under subject headings that either consist of a place name and topical subdivisions, e.g.

CHICAGO—DESCRIPTION

CHICAGO—HISTORY

CHICAGO—POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT

CHICAGO—RIOT, 1919.

...etc.

or, as in the case of nonprint subject headings, consist of a place name, period-double-space, and the name of structure associated with that place, e.g.

CHICAGO. CLARENCE BUCKINGHAM FOUNTAIN

CHICAGO. JOHN HANCOCK CENTER

...etc.

Thus, the place name headings fulfilled a collocating function that was different from the usual gathering function of a heading. These headings brought together a number of works by and about organizations within a geographic locale and subarranged them in a complex, if not logical, manner.

Later works do not demonstrate any greater clarity on the question of choice of name until the hierarchy of choices defined in the 1967 code. In this 1967 code governments are identified by a conventional name and other bodies are identified by the name that represents the type that comes first in the following list,

1. conventional name e.g.
   Westminister Abbey
   xCollegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminister

2. name used by the body on its publications e.g.,
   American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
   x A. F. L. - C. I. O.
   Stanford University
   x Leland Stanford Junior University

3. brief form, e.g.,
   Unesco

4. Official form, e.g.,
   National Educational Association of the United States

5. Predominant form

6. Most recent form

Even though no reasons are given for this hierarchy it is an advance in the sense that it gives explicit guidelines for choice. Incidentally, there, apparently, will be some variation in the hierarchy as defined in 1978 but the differences do not appear significant,

1. Conventional name

2. name used by the body on its publications

3. Predominant form

4. Brief form, e.g., AFL-CIO

5. Reference sources

6. Official form

Once the name for a corporate body has been selected, its form must be defined. Those questions pertaining to form which have been most discussed are

1. When to show hierarchy

2. How to choose between variants that represent

   a) different languages
   b) different romanizations
   c) different spellings
   ...etc.

3. What types of identifiers or qualifiers to use in order to distinguish between bodies that have the same or similar names

4. Use of prescribed punctuation to introduce elements of a corporate name.

In addition there have been recurrent discussions concerning such variations in form as inversion because of the present trend toward direct entry. The rules where inversion was formerly prescribed have evolved either into rules requiring conventional names or, for a time, into rules for entry under place names. Thus, orders of knighthood, religious orders, etc. are now (according to the 1967 code) entered under conventional names, e.g.,

Templars

Benedictines

In those cases where conventional names are not involved the trend is markedly towards direct entry under the name as it reads, often without showing hierarchy. This is true without regard to whether the name is generic in character or begins with a generic word or includes the name of a place, etc., e.g.

1. A. K. Smiley Public Library
   (rather than: Smiley (A.K.) Public Library)

2. Boreal Institute for Northern Studies
   (rather than: Alberta. University, Edmonton. Boreal Institute)

3. Defence Research Board (Canada)
   (rather than: Canada. Defence Research Board)

4. Indiana University

5. Public Archives of Canada
   (rather than: Canada. Public Archives)

6. University of Illinois

However initial articles are still omitted, e.g.

Club (London, England)

Library Association

Thus, all of these practices show a trend toward direct entry under the

name as it reads. Such practices make it easier for the cataloger to establish the heading and they make it easier for the person who seeks a known name to predict its position within the alphabetical list.

Hierarchy is said to be shown in a corporate name when the name of a subordinate part of a corporate name is introduced by the name of either entire body or at least of a superordinate part of the body. There is some difference in form between those headings which name a subordinate unit of a government agency and those that name a subordinate unit of some other type of government body. In the case of government agency, if it is to be named as a part of the government, the first element of the heading is the conventional name of the government and then, if hierarchy is shown, by the names of one or more superordinate agencies. Thus, for example, the following headings show hierarchy

Public Library Association. Audiovisual Committee

Hierarchy: American Library Association
Public Library Association
Audiovisual Committee

United States. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education.

Hierarchy: United States
Department of Health Education and Welfare
Office of Education

Indian Health Service. Inpatient Care Branch

Hierarchy: United States
Department of Health Education and Welfare
Public Health Service
Health Services Administration
Indian Health Service
Division of Resource Coordination
Office of Program Statistics
Inpatient Care Branch

Logically, hierarchy could be shown all of the time, none of the time, or some of the time. Historically, all codes have chosen some of the time but the trend has been towards showing hierarchy less and less frequently. This makes for shorter headings that are easier to file. In addition, fewer headings are collocated into a single file by and about the same agency. Thus, the hypothetical sequence

South Bend. Century Center. Art Center.
South Bend. Century Center. Theater for the Performing Arts.
South Bend. Century Center. Discovery Hall Museum.
South Bend. Public Library.
etc.

exemplifies both the old practice of entry under place name and the practice of showing hierarchy. A number of publications by and about organizations in South Bend are brought together in sequence through such means. They could all be adequately identified, however, with headings that named the body directly and added South Bend and Century Center as identifiers when needed thus,

South Bend Art Center (Century Center)

Theatre for the Performing Arts (South Bend : Century Center)

Discovery Hall Museum (South Bend : Century Center)

Such headings, of course, would not assemble information by and about South Bend and its institutions in a single place in the catalog but they fully identify each body for finding list purposes.

Corporate headings have always shown considerable variation in language. In general American codes have favored conventional names in English language (i.e., the language of the user) for major corporate bodies and used the language of the body for organizations that were not well known in the English language. This, however, is not satisfactory at the international level and, as a consequence, it can be expected

that the language of the body or persons named will be used more frequently. Thus, we would now, in 1978, say

Magallanes, Fernando de

rather than

Magellan, Ferdinand

and it is quite possible that, in the code after the next, we will say

Ordo Sancti Benedicti

rather than use an English form of the conventional name, e.g.

Benedictines

Incidentally, this problem is closely connected to the question of using conventional names because the language of the conventional name depends on the reference source consulted.

As might be expected the use of identifiers or qualifiers becomes even more important for corporate names when hierarchy is not shown. This was already illustrated in the hypothetical examples for South Bend given above. Identifiers include such terms as place names, countries, dates, characterizing phrases, etc., e.g. Catholic Church. Pope. (1878-1903 : Leo XIII)

Apollo (Spacecraft)

Friedburg (Ger : Bavaria)

Friedburg (Ger : Hesse)

Knights Templar (Masonic Order)

St. John's Church (Washington, D.C., U.S. : Georgetown)

St. John's Church ( Washington, D.C., U.S. : Lafayette Square)

The only significant change in the choice and sequence of identifiers at the present time pertains to names of conferences where the sequence has been changed from

[number], [place], [date].

to

[number], [date], [place].

thus

World Peace Conference (1st : 1949 : Paris, France and Prague)

This suggestion was recommended by Verona in her 1975 study and has the advantage, for those conferences that are not numbered, of arranging them in the sequence in which they occurred.

Another one of her suggestions was to define punctuation that could be used for headings in the same way as prescribed punctuation is used in the descriptive portion of a catalog record in order to identify the type of information introduced. This is one of the tasks of the present Working Group on Corporate Headings but their recommendations come too late for the second edition of the AACR. In this 1978 edition a period-double-space introduces the agency of a government or a subordinate unit of either a government or other body. Identifiers are enclosed in parentheses. Different types of identifiers are introduced with a space-colon-space and identifiers of the same type are separated with a comma-space. In the report of the Working Group the use of a space-semicolon-space is recommended to introduce all second and successive types of identifiers.

To summarize the development of codes suggest

1) that problems of choice and form of a corporate name are gradually being more explicitly categorized. This will lead to greater predictability for specific names and forms of names and will make the catalog a more efficient tool for finding known publications.

2) at the same time the choice of name is leading to a catalog that is far less effective as a collocating tool and will be of less use to the user who is trying to find something but is not sure of exactly wh

e.g. Why would the user be better served with a choice of entries such as

Bureau of Census and Statistics (Australia)
Bureau of Statistics (Canada)
Bureau of the Census (United States)
Census and Statistics Dept. (New Zealand)

as was suggested in one discussion rather than by a clump of different entries all pertaining to the same country?

3) More and more frequently corporate headings will be used as added entries rather than main entries because of the ambiguity of their author relationship to the work in question.